



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,304	12/20/2001	Naoki Ito	TAP.P0004	1308

7590 11/26/2003  
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber  
Fourth Floor, First National Tower  
Akron, OH 44308-1456

EXAMINER

CONLEY, SEAN E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1744

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-5, drawn to disinfectant for teats of animals comprising lysozyme, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
  - II. Claims 6-10, drawn to method for improving micro-organism environment harmful to animals comprising spraying lysozyme in the barn of animals, classified in class 422, subclass 28.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using the product. An alternative process for using the composition would be to dip the teats of animals into the composition comprising lysozyme instead of spraying lysozyme in the barn containing the animals.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

5. During a telephone conversation with Edward Greive on November 4, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 6-10 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blackburn et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,858,962).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Blackburn et al. disclose a composition for treating mastitis and other staphylococcal infections in animals. The composition comprises lysostaphin as well as other bacteriolytic agents such as lysozyme (see col. 3, lines 7-29). The lysozyme is obtained from chicken egg whites and this form of lysozyme is known as albumen lysozyme (see col. 4, line 43). The composition is used primarily as part of a daily teat-dipping regimen in which the teats of American dairy cows are dipped into the composition in order to prevent infection (see col. 2, lines 1-25 and col. 4, lines 23-41).

Regarding claim 5, albumen lysozyme is a protein found in the egg of a chicken and the lysozyme further comprises several amino acids. One of the amino acids present in albumen lysozyme is glycine.

8. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 91/17469 to Kahan.

Regarding claims 1-4, Kahan discloses an aqueous composition for treating contact lenses. The composition comprises a wetting and a cleaning composition. Specifically, the cleaning composition comprises 0.1 to 1.0 wt % of egg white lysozyme (albumen lysozyme from fowls). The lysozyme has been included in the cleaning composition primarily for its bacteriostatic effect in order to protect the eye from infection as well as protect the solution itself against microbiological contaminations (see page 7,

line 11 and page 11, lines 9-13). It should be noted that the intended use of the disinfectant composition recited in the preamble of claim 1 is not given patentable weight.

Regarding claim 5, albumen lysozyme is a protein found in the egg of a chicken and the lysozyme further comprises several amino acids. One of the amino acids present in albumen lysozyme is glycine.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackburn et al.

Blackburn et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the specific weight % of the lysozyme present in the disinfect composition. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include lysozyme in amounts of 0.5 wt.% or more in the disinfectant composition, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Conley, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2430. Beginning December 16, 2003, the examiners phone number will change to (571) 272-1273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Robert Warden, can be reached at (703) 308-2920. The Unofficial fax

Art Unit: 1744

phone number for this group is (703) 305-7719. The Official fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310. The direct fax number to the examiner is (703)-746-8859. Beginning December 16, 2003, the direct fax to the examiner will change to (571)273-1273.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite the processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [robert.warden@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

SEC *fe*

November 14, 2003

*Robert T. Warden, Jr.*